

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

(There are no amendments to the drawings)

### REMARKS

The specification is objected to because of informalities. Specifically, the specification is objected to because of the misspelling of "collimator" throughout the specification. The specification is amended as requested by the Examiner to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-10, 16, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Watanabe (JP 2001-297457). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Watanabe fails to disclose a first collimator lens moving means for moving a collimator lens.

In Watanabe, a collimator lens is disposed into an optical element 17 which contains a laser diode (172, Figure 2), and an actuator 21 (Figure 4) moves the optical element 17 as a whole. Then, the collimator lens does not moving independently.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each and every element of claims 1 and 16 as discussed above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 16 are allowable over the applied art.

Claims 4-10 depend from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 16 and includes all of the features of claim 16. Thus, the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason the independent claims are allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Yoo (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,216). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 16 and includes all of the features of claim 16. Thus, the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason the independent claims are allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Newly-added claims 21 and 22 also include features not shown in the applied art.

Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Dated: March 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

Carl Schaukowitch

Registration No.: 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC  
Correspondence Customer Number: 23353  
Attorneys for Applicant

Attachments:     Amendment Transmittal  
                      Clean Version of Substitute Specification  
                      Marked-Up Version of Substitute Specification

DC268036.DOC